67. Conversion of the village road from Mavelikara to Kozhencherri into a cart-road.

Mr. Kochu Thomman Kuruvila (Member, Chengannur taluk) said that he would divide the proposed road into two portions—the one from Mavelikara to Chengannur *via* Kollakadavu and Kodukulanji, and the other from Chengannur to Kozhencherri *via* Puthencavu and Aranmula. On the first portion, only 2½ miles of road had to be laid. As he learnt that the estimate for the work had been sanctioned, he would only press for the work being started at once.

In regard to the second portion, he said that there was a village road up to Kozhencherri, over a distance of 7 miles. Kozhencherri could also be reached through the Pampa river. But the river would be extremely dangerous for navigation during the monsoon, while, in the hot months of the year, there would not be enough water in it. It was therefore necessary to improve the village road. It was really a tap-road, for, from Kozhencherri, there were roads to Rani, Koni, Pathanamthitta and other places. One mile of the road up to Puthencavu was in good condition and the remaining 6 miles had to be gravelled. He requested that that portion might also be improved along with the first line.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

68. The need for a road from the Kozhencherri-Pathanamthitta road to Thumpamon-Ampalakadavu.

Mr. S. Padmanabha Panicker (Member, Nominated) requested that a new road should be constructed from Vayyanikulam on the Koni–Pathanamthitta road to Thumpamon–Ambalakadavu *via* Punakad, Kuzhikala and Elavanthitta. The distance would be 8 miles. The road was very necessary for about 3,500 families living within an area of 120 square miles between the Kulakkada river in the south and the Pampa in the north. There was the Sri Mularajagopalapuram Market at Elavanthitta, named after His Highness the Maha Raja and the Dewan, which was opened in 1085, and a village Anchal office and a grant-in-aid middle school at Kuzhikala. The full benefits accruing from those institutions could not be enjoyed for want of a road. The ryots of the locality would be willing to give the lands necessary for the road free of compensation. He requested therefore that the road might be sanctioned.

The Member next said that the other branch roads in the locality were very narrow and in a neglected condition. There were circular orders enjoining the people to keep them in good condition. He requested that the matter might receive attention.

He added that the road from Pandalam to Aranmula, No. 14 in the list of roads for the Quilon Division, had not been done, though road No. 15 was improved already. He requested that the road might be taken up and improved at once.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

69. The desirability of improving the Kuttipuzha Canal.

The Very Revd. Iype Thoma Kathanar (Member, Thiruvalla taluk) stated that before proceeding to his subject, he felt it his duty to say a few words in reference to the words that fell from the lips of a Member from Agastiswaram on Saturday last. He did not understand that Member when he made the unwarranted statements, because he spoke in English; but it gave him extreme pain when he knew from his brother-Members subsequently what it was that the man said. It pained him because he knew it gave just cause for resentment and sorrow to the Government. The object of that Member, as he was able since to understand him, was nothing short of doing away with that important and useful institution, the Sri Mulam Popular Assembly. The Assembly was not an institution which the people obtained from the Government by coercion. But it was a voluntary gift of His Highness the Maha Raja to his people, and it showed the keen and earnest solicitude of His Highness to know at first hand the wants and wishes of the people and to grant them the needed relief. The proceedings in the Assembly during the ten years of its existence

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

—of which no less than seven Sessions were presided over by the present Dewan—far from being a sham, had more than justified its existence and fulfilled the noble object with which it was started. He therefore requested, both on his own behalf and on behalf of the other Members of the Assembly with many of whom he had talked on the subject, that the unwarranted statements of the single Member should *not* be viewed by the Government as representing the general opinion of the Assembly. The Assembly did *not* share in his the man's view, but it was that Member's own individual opinion.

Dewan.—I know of course that what that one Member said about the Government and about the Assembly was his individual opinion and was not shared by any other Member here. I knew it at the time and I know it also now. This is the Tenth Session of the Assembly, and of these ten Sessions, I have presided over seven. If, after having known you for seven years, I am likely to make the mistake of imagining that the individual opinion of one man is the opinion of this large Assembly, I should be unworthy to preside at this Assembly. I permitted that Member to say what he had to say, not because I had not the right or power to stop him and ask him to resume his seat, but because it was well that he should be permitted to say what he had to say, so that all of you may judge of the reasonableness of what he said. In all Assemblies like this, it is to the interests of the Assembly that each individual Member should be governed by the general sense of the Assembly, instead of being controlled solely by any order from the President. I have great pleasure not only in having received the assurance from you, but also in knowing that what you have said is the opinion of a great many others like you. It is impossible, in the case of a large Assembly like this, to have every one of the one hundred Members *ideally* reasonable. Differences of opinion are inevitable. And it is necessary that all the various opinions should be freely expressed here. If only those things are to be expressed which would be entirely agreeable to the Government, then there is no necessity for your coming here. It has, therefore, been my policy to encourage you all to say *freely* what you have to say, and that policy will be continued. But, at the same time, what I particularly regret is not what that Member had said against the Government, but what he said about his fellow-members of the Assembly. He said, if I remember aright, that the whole Assembly was a sham, and that you all come here year after year to participate in that sham. It is most unfortunate that he should have said that. I would certainly advise him—though I have no right to enforce it on him—to apologise to his fellow-members. I do not care to ask him to apologise to me. It is most unfortunate that, in an Assembly like this, a gulf should begin to yawn between the different sections of it.

The Member then continued and said that the Manimala river flowed through the part where the Kaviyur and Thiruvalla *pakuthies* met. There was what was called the Kathodu at that place, flowing from east to west. On the west of that *thodu* were the Kaviyur *puncha* lands, about 20,000 paras in extent, and on the four sides of those paddy fields were hills. During the rains, water collected in the fields to about two men's height. A good portion of it never subsided but had to be drained away. The Kuttipuzha Canal served the purpose of a drainage channel to carry away the water. It was also an irrigation channel. The canal had become silted up and the vast area of puncha lands suffered much ever since. To the east of the canal, there were 2,000 paras of *virippu* land fit for sugarcane cultivation. They also suffered for want of water in the canal. If the canal be cut, then, in addition to benefiting the abovesaid lands, it would also help the conversion of the hill slopes on the four sides of the *puncha* lands into cocoanut gardens. The canal was also useful to the ryots of the Changanacherri taluk. The Peishkars of both the Quilon and Kottayam Divisions were therefore in favor of opening the canal. The whole length of the canal had not to be cut, but only a dsitance of a quarter of a mile. The question had been pressed on the attention of the Government in successive Sessions, but no action had yet been taken. He therefore prayed that the necessity for opening the canal be impartially investigated, before the idea was given up.

Mr. K. Velayudhan Pillai (Member, Changanacherri taluk) said that he fully supported the Member that had just spoken, and he added that about 50,000

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

paras of *puncha* lands in the Changanacherri taluk would also be benefited if the canal be opened. It would also be useful for bringing leaf manure &c. and for taking things to the market at Changanacherri.

Dewan's reply.—Action will now be taken to start the work.

70. The need for the construction of a road from Thiruvalla to Mepral.

The Very Revd. Iype Thoma Kathanar (Member, Thiruvalla taluk) requested that a road should be constructed from Thiruvalla to Mepral, over a distance of 4 miles. The people of Mepral had constantly to go to Thiruvalla and the market there. About 500 school-boys and some girls had also to cross the Peringara river at much risk and go daily to the schools in Thiruvalla. A road over the short distance of 4 miles was therefore very necessary.

Dewan's reply.—An estimate for the road will be called for.

71. The necessity for constructing a road from the Puramittom market in Kallupara, to join the Manimala road.

Mr. Ramavarmar Kothavarmar Koviladhikarikal (Member, Thiruvalla taluk) represented that there were no roads from the Puramittom market to Ezhumattur and the neighbouring *pakuthies*, and that much difficulty was experienced by the public. The Member requested that the road leading from the Thiruvalla Taluk Cutcherry to the Puramittom market should be extended, to join the Manimala road *via* Vennikulam, Ezhumattur, Perumpatty and other *pakuthies*. The proposed extension would be about 10 miles in length.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

72. The necessity for constructing foot-bridges over the Commercial and the Vadai Canals.

Mr. M. Chinnappa Pillai (Member, T. I. C., Alleppey) said that the distance from the entrance of the Commercial Canal at Chungam to the Stone Bridge was 1,940 feet and that a bridge at the entrance connecting the roads on the northern and southern banks was absolutely necessary. The length of the Commercial Canal from Chungam to the Triple Bridge was 9,640 feet. There were only six bridges within that distance. The interspace between those bridges was too long. It was therefore necessary to span the canal with many more bridges for the convenience of the public. The Member suggested that one foot-bridge between Chungam and the Stone Bridge, one between the Stone Bridge and the Iron Bridge, two between the Iron Bridge and the Kothuval Bridge, and one between the Kothuval Bridge and the Kunnen Warkey Bridge, might be constructed.

The Member next said that the Vadai Canal was also as long as the Commercial Canal and that there were at present only two bridges on the Canal. The distance between them was 4,811 feet. The two bridges were quite inadequate to meet the present requirements of the public. The fact that a Government ferry boat was now plying between its banks midway between the bridges was ample proof of the need for more bridges. He therefore requested that foot-bridges might be constructed at the places where the several roads from the Commercial Canal met the Vadai Canal and that one foot-bridge at the entrance of the Canal and two where it joined the West Junction Canal be also provided.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

73. The need for the construction of a Satrom at Warkala.

Mr. V. Kesavan Mallan (Member, Nominated) said that the absence of a Sirkar satrom at Warkala was being keenly felt by the numerous Brahmin devotees that went

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly